

1. The reply filed on May 29, 2008 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): The restriction requirement dated May 1, 2008 specified that "The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added" (page 3, last paragraph). However, the claims specified by applicant in the reply to the restriction requirement cannot be the correct set of claims readable on the elected species. For example, applicants elected acrylic acid as one of the species and state that claims 107-111 read on this species. Since claim 107 depends from claim 77, 70, and 65, these claims also necessarily read on the elected species.

2. Thus, the claim set upon which examination should properly proceed was unclear. Applicants are required to provide an accurate listing of the claims readable upon the elected species which will be examined further on the merits of the claims. Such clarification will facilitate future examination by ensuring that examination commences on the proper claim set.

3. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. **EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).**

KSO

/Patrick J. Nolan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4161